Executive Committee of the
Members Council on Library Services (MCLS)
Conference Call
Agenda
Tuesday, October 28, 2014 – 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon EDT

Dial-in Number: **1-888-670-3525**
Participant Passcode: **575 614 9391** followed by the # key

10:00	**Call to Order**	Janice Henderson
10:00 – 10:02	**1. Public Comment**	
10:02 – 10:05	**2. Approve September 26, 2014 Meeting Minutes**	Janice Henderson
10:05 – 11:05	**3. Next-Gen ILS**	Jean Phillips, Anne Prestamo
	A. Task Force Update	
	B. Evaluation/Selection Team Makeup	Janice Henderson
11:05 – 11:20	**4. E-Textbook Discussion**	Janice Henderson
11:20 – 11:25	**5. Update from Members Council on Distance Learning and Student Services (MCDLSS)**	Pat DeSalvo
	A. Joint MCLS and MCDLSS Meeting	Janice Henderson
11:25 – 11:50	**6. Update from FLVC**	Don Muccino, Lucy Harrison
	A. Transition Update	
	B. Organizational Updates	
	C. Project Updates	
11:50 – 11:55	**7. Executive Committee Meetings**	Janice Henderson
	A. Future Topics	
	B. Next Meeting Date	
11:55 – 12:00	**8. New Business**	Janice Henderson
	A. Follow-up on E-Resources MCLS Discussion	
4:00	**Adjournment**	Janice Henderson

Regular Meeting of the Executive Committee
of the Members Council on Library Services (MCLS)

October 28, 2014

A meeting of the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) Executive Committee (ExCom) of the Members Council on Library Services to discuss regular business was called to order at 10:02 AM EDT pursuant to notice sent to all committee members.

The following committee members were present: Chair Janice Henderson (Northwest Florida State), Pat DeSalvo (Seminole State), Lori Driscoll (Gulf Coast State), Bill Foege (Polk State), Patricia Profeta (Indian River State), Anne Prestamo (FIU), Barry Baker (UCF), Bob Dugan (UWF), and Julia Zimmerman (FSU). The following FLVC staff was also present: Tammy Elliott, Don Muccino, Lucy Harrison, Lauren Sproull, Ellen Bishop, and John Opper, and Dave Whisenant. Guests: Jean Phillips and Leona Jones

Chair Henderson called the meeting to order and Patricia Profeta recorded the proceedings of the meeting.

Roll was called and the number of voting members present determined.

Agenda
Chair Henderson adjusted the order of the agenda switching items 4 and 6.

Public Comment
Chair Henderson called for public comment. No public comment was forthcoming.

Approval of September 26, 2014 and October 14, 2014 Minutes
Having reviewed the draft minutes distributed prior to the meeting the committee moved to approval for the September 26 and October 14 minutes. Chair Henderson asked for a motion to approve. Anne Prestamo moved to approve both sets of minutes and Julia Zimmerman seconded. The voting members unanimously approved the minutes.

Next-Gen ILS Requirements Task Force Process
Jean Phillips reviewed the work of the task force to date and acknowledged receipt of survey results, which FLVC is compiling. The compilation is due to the task force by October 31. Based on this feedback, the task force can revise the document. The group spent most of its time reviewing the evaluation process and how the members see it working for this ITN. The task force has a proposal for the ExCom and seeks feedback. The process is based on the information FLVC received from UWF about the procurement process. The process is more understandable to the task force now. The task force needs further clarification from the ExCom in a few areas.

There will be an evaluation team appointed. The evaluation team will review the responses. Jean Phillips said that she would be talking in sections and subsections. The task force also spoke to Orbis Cascade again. The task force has a proposal for the weighting that they determined as a group. The weightings for most major sections are about 16%-18%. Systems section was 18%. Collections and Resource

Management section was 17%. Description and Metadata section was 16%. Circulation and Resource Sharing section was 17%. Discovery and User Experience section was 16%. Joint Use Facilities section was 6%. Much of what is in the Joint Use section is in other places. Price section was 5%. The task force does not have much information about how price is reviewed. Business References and Vendor Capacity section was 5% for each factor. Each member will look at responses to the requirements in the document. They'll grade each response in each subsection as met, not met, or exemplary. The task force members are writing criteria statements for each of the items. The description will be an indication of what "met" means. Using that information, each member of the evaluation team will create scoring for each of the seven sections with the maximum points for each section based on the individual subsections. A mathematical formula will not be recommended because not all subsections are of equal importance. Members tally the section scores from the evaluation team. The members can discuss the results and adjust the overall score as needed. Vendors with the highest scores will be invited to provide a demo; however, a maximum of four vendors will be invited. The timeline indicates that these demos must occur soon after the scores are tallied. After the demos, the team evaluates them based on the same criteria and follows the same process for final scoring. Once the final scoring is determined, the members can choose how many of the vendors with which they would like to negotiate for pricing. The pricing part has not been addressed in detail because it is usually a different group that handles the negotiation. The rest of what the task force needed to report was the relationship of the ILS to the discovery tool. The task force has assumptions that they need to ask the ExCom to clarify.

- Is this process a procurement primarily for an ILS? Then we can add a discovery tool if we need.
- Is this process a procurement for an ILS and a discovery tool?
    - ILS vendor provides a discovery tool (e.g., Ex Libris and Primo) all bundled together.
    - ILS vendor subcontracts the discovery tool (e.g., III and EDS).
    - ILS vendor can work with various discovery tools, but doesn't include one in the bid.

The task force believed that these options are viable if this procurement is mainly for an ILS. They wanted to make sure that how they do the evaluation addresses those three questions to come to a conclusion.

- If there is no discovery tool that meets our needs, is Mango with a central index an option? If so, how is it evaluated?
- If a new discovery tool is selected, can some libraries keep Mango because Mango has functionality not yet seen with other discovery tools, like browse and known item searching and many of the UBorrow features?
- What are we evaluating for the options of the discovery tool?
- Is the ILS actually what we are focusing upon?

Don Muccino said that UWF talked to legislative staff last Thursday. The general guidelines for their expectation are to provide and support a single set of tools tool (FLVC thinks of as a single discovery tool with an index and ILS bundled) for the 40 institutions. The expectation is an 18-24 month implementation. There is not a lot of new money in the State for its funding.

Jean Phillips said that if Mango is not the selected discovery tool, FLVC cannot support it.

Lucy Harrison said that it might be helpful to think of discovery as having the interface separate from the index. It might be helpful to think about it as the ILS, the discovery interface, and the discovery index. The interface is almost the least of our problems as we have Mango. The scoring is already set up so vendors get full points on discovery if they have their own or they interface with Mango. If the discovery

tool for the chosen ILS vendor is not going to meet our needs, I think it is not an issue as long as it can integrate with Mango. We already have the staff and the infrastructure in place for Mango. It is already set up and running. That is almost a non-issue. The index is a separate issue. The index is both a financial and a procurement issue. We want the index to be closely embedded with discovery tool. If we think about having the index the required part of this system, then the discovery interface being the one the vendor has or we can use Mango. We are okay with either option. If whatever comes with the next-gen system doesn't meet our needs, we will go with Mango. For the index, the ILS vendor and the discovery tool index may come from the same vendor. The ILS vendor may subcontract for the discovery index to come from another vendor. They will need to provide a bid/quote for that aspect as part of their response to the ITN. Ideally, separate prices will be provided for those for comparison. If they want to bundle, it needs to be bundled with the next-gen ILS and not bundled as part of the discovery tool. Jean Phillips said that the task force would rewrite part of the document to ensure that this step occurs. They are being asked about their central index and there are questions that will reveal some of that information. Are we saying that a vendor needs to bid a mega index? Lucy Harrison is not saying that they have to bid a mega index. The question arises if a vendor does not include a central index as part of the bid. FLVC would have to start a new procurement to select one.

Barry Baker said that there needs to be an option so we can select the best discovery tool as part of the ILS or as a stand-alone that we contract with a vendor to get. To say that you will go with a tool that is part of an ILS is a mistake. It's a step backward. We could get a discovery tool worse than the one we have. Don Muccino said that cost and time would then be a factor. Lucy Harrison said this is our one shot to get money for this initiative. If FLVC requests money for a separate discovery tool, the request would not be received favorably. All decided that Mango was what they wanted. She said that the index is a separate issue. Jean Phillips asked if we would be evaluating Mango as a discovery tool as we will be evaluating other vendor products. Lucy Harrison said yes only in the sense that it interfaces with another discovery tool. Jean Phillips said that it won't get points for other things like the other vendors. The document needs to reflect the options.

Lucy Harrison reviewed the percentages (15-16%) for discovery tool. Jean Phillips said that the discovery tool was the one area where the group did not agree 100%. Three felt the discovery tool if the discovery tool and the ILS purchased together needed more weighting. The other members of the group thought the ILS is more important than the discovery tool. The back end needed to work well. The discovery tool was weighted more than the ILS. It is equal to circulation, but not equal to the ILS. Barry Baker said that the discovery tool is important, but to take something that is not as good as we can get is a mistake. There are other products under development coming down the pike. Pat DeSalvo asked about the importance of evaluating Mango. We will be looking at different ILS. Mango needs to be a mesh. We need to look at it in this environment. Lucy Harrison said that Mango is developed in house, so there is no way for FLVC to respond to this bid on behalf of Mango. Plus we do not have an ILS. Dave Whisenant said that the issue with Mango is that we know what it is and what it does. The vendor needs to bid against what we know about our own product. Jean Phillips asked how that worked in the scoring. How can a vendor that uses Mango score against a vendor that does not use Mango? Lucy Harrison thought the question dealt with interoperability. Jean Phillips said that that is just a part of it. So, we can assume Mango for any vendor that does not bundle one. Barry Baker asked if we are eliminating an ILS that doesn't have a discovery tool. Can they contract with a vendor that does? Does that appear in that section? Dave Whisenant said that we are asking vendors to reply. We are expecting them to complete that requirement by identifying those vendors. Jean Phillips asked that we are going to require that they include a discovery tool and a mega index in their bid to obtain maximum points. For example, a vendor without a discovery tool needs to find a discovery tool. Chair Henderson said that they might also know how they will interface with Mango. Lucy Harrison said that Mango does not have an index, so the bid

needs to at least include an index. It can be more than one index, too. Jean Phillips said a vendor could work with various discovery tools, but doesn't bid one is not really an option. Lucy Harrison said that you may get a vendor that responds, but the question at that point is there more money left without having to ask for additional funds? How can we very quickly set up procurement process? Jean Phillips said the vendor needs to know not to spend the time submitting a bid if the task force is not going to consider it. We have to get instructions to the vendors. The response needs to include a discovery tool or explain how your product interacts with any discovery tool. Jean Phillips asked if we want to do only one ITN at a time because of financial reasons. Barry Baker said that the vendor either has one or they contract with another vendor and provide us with full information.

Jean Phillips said that some of these vendors might not use subcontractors as a business model. If you are a contractor, you take the responsibilities of a subcontractor. Are we telling a vendor not to bid unless they have a discovery tool subcontractor? Chair Henderson said that they could use Mango as a subcontract as long as they provided us information about a mega index. We want details about that relationship and how we would acquire it. Jean Phillips said that it has to be a bundle. All vendors must bid a discovery tool with a mega index or at the very least, a mega index. Lucy Harrison said that a vendor might not have a great discovery tool, but it has capabilities to interface with Mango as a replacement. Jean Phillips said that we do not want to pay for it if we are not using it. Lucy Harrison said that if a new discovery tool is selected, but some libraries want to continue with Mango, we need a solution for everyone. If the discovery tool does not meet the needs of the institutions, we would use Mango instead and all will be on Mango. Jean Phillips asked if there is a choice and the 38 love the discovery tool and two universities want to stay with Summon, is FLVC saying that it won't support the output of records to a different discovery tool. Lucy Harrison said no, but we must keep in mind that our servers are at the NWRDC. It might also be that an institution has a different relationship to get those records loaded (e.g., OCLC). FLVC would not support two interfaces.

Anne Prestamo said that we need to go back, with assistance from Ellen Bishop and Dave Whisenant, to clarify language. It puts a different spin on how the evaluation criteria for discovery are going to be written. Along with decoupling discovery from ILS, within discovery we need to decouple interface versus central index. Lucy Harrison said that in the requirements document, you already have separate requirements for the interface and a separate section for the index. You just need to make clear in the pricing and the scoring and you may need to add some additional questions to which they have to respond. Lucy Harrison asked another question about the evaluation criteria. At the MCLS in September, the administrators said they wanted to weigh in on the criteria. Is something going to be shared with the larger MCLS? If so, at what level should it be shared? Right now you have the percentages, but it also sounds like you are working on very detailed criteria that are going to mirror the requirements. Is it necessary or desired to share those with the entire MCLS? If so, we have to think about how we will accomplish this? It's almost like doing a survey all over again with that level of detail.

Anne Prestamo said that a related point is that the task force, largely due to Jean Phillip's guidance, has continued to work productively on the weighting and criteria questions. She also discussed the concern of the current task force that new members might need time to digest all of the work to date. Barry Baker said let's share the criteria as early as we can so MCLS can review. It shows transparency in what's going on and that's important. Chair Henderson said that we send the criteria being reviewed today be sent with our request for additional people on the evaluation team. Ellen Bishop said that we are not putting the survey out to collect feedback from the MCLS. It is more for the evaluation team to have an opportunity for feedback. Although Chair Henderson said that if someone sees a problem, we would expect him or her to identify it. A question was raised about the timeline; however, Barry Baker said that the document can be shared and people can respond if they choose. Chair Henderson said that the

evaluation team could use items received randomly if they choose to do so. Chair Henderson said that even if the MCLS has not endorsed the document, the ExCom meets on November 19. Individuals will know if they have been nominated by that time. If they have seen the requirements prior to December 8, they have time to catch up. Jean Phillips said that the task force would adjust the document based on the survey results. That document should be ready about one week before the ExCom meeting.

Chair Henderson led a discussion about the percentages, variations in scoring, and the ability for the task force to make adjustments in the final review. The level of detail discussed by the ExCom is reflected in the document. Additionally, the task force discussed the variation in points and the range is based on their suggestions. Anne Prestamo said that today's discussion should not affect the weighting, but the criteria statements. Various sections and subsections do have some reliability redundancy built in.

Chair Henderson led a discussion on the makeup of the selection team. The MCLS can provide feedback on the demos, but the selection team will judge and make the final decision. The evaluation team will include members from the existing task force, but also new members. Chair Henderson will send out an email detailing the expertise required for the selection task force (e.g., functional expertise, super users, etc.). There was also discussion about FLVC's involvement as members of the selection task force. Some ExCom members were opposed as these members would be voting members. Is there anyone that can represent the expertise of the FLVC without involving FLVC personnel? Ellen Bishop indicated that UWF indicated that the selection team should not be large. Chair Henderson will draft a call for new task force members.

Update from FLVC
Don Muccino said that the transition is moving forward with UWF HR at FLVC to review employee benefits in advance of the open enrollment period with January 1, 2015 as the date to transfer the staff. Other HR concerns are being addressed. FLVC is removing the old web platform and working on the new website and its branding. UWF can assist with marketing. Services continue at their existing levels. FLVC is reviewing contracting options. Chair Henderson indicated that a letter regarding the transition would be sent to stakeholders to describe the transition process and current status. Lucy Harrison's regular monthly report will be sent this week. FLVC is still waiting for HathiTrust to process the enhanced holdings file. Primo is being upgraded to a new version (more of a stability update, not interface or functionality changes).

Eight colleges are using Mango as a discovery tool. Institutions can be moved at any time. The UISC is also reviewing the statewide Mango page to clean up confusing features, e.g. home institution and login. FLVC added ProQuest citations to the PRIMO Central Index. Some questions will be followed up with ProQuest, e.g., login before seeing options, limiting functions. There is also the plan to drop Syndetics and move all institutions to Google. Islandora is moving forward. Two institutions requested a site. Information shared about moving PALMM collections so they are discoverable and eliminating DigiTool.

Update from Members Council on Distance Learning and Student Services (MCDLSS)
Pat DeSalvo said that the MCDLSS will not meet until November 13 and 14. Chair Henderson indicated that she and Vicky Westergard are discussing Seminole State College and logistics as the joint meeting site using one large room for the joint meeting with breakout rooms for the MCs. They are considering 3-4 dates for late spring.

E-Textbooks
The discussion has been postponed.

Executive Committee Meetings
Future Topics
Chair Henderson reviewed future meeting topics (including the topics for the MCLS December meeting: Next-Gen ILS Requirements Task Force Process, 2016 eResources package, the decommissioning of DigiTool, and eTextbooks).

Next Meeting Date
The next ExCom meeting has been set for November 19 at 10:00am.

New Business
As a follow-up to the eResources MCLS discussion, Chair Henderson identified areas and questions from the members. She will send her observations to the ExCom for further discussion and process/structure development (e.g., eResource purchase process and philosophy). Yesterday's decision and changes will be announced via an email message.

Adjournment
Chair Henderson asked for a motion to adjourn. Bob Dugan moved to adjourn and Pat DeSalvo seconded. Chair Henderson adjourned the meeting at 11:51AM.